Philosophy Now

Philosophy Now Forum
For the discussion of all things philosophical, especially articles in the magazine Philosophy Now.

Search...

Quick links FAQ · Register Login

Philosophy Now magazine ‹ Board index ‹ Philosophical Discussion ‹ General Philosophical Discussion

Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply · Search this topic... · 731 posts 1 … 42 43 44 45 46 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:36 am

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 12:06 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Wed Aug 13, 2025 3:48 am
> >
> > Existence is both thing and nothing...a paradox.
>
> This is your entire point. You claim this is a paradox.
>
> However it isn't because nothing is a thing, a concept or a term. Both are things thus no paradox.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Thu Aug 14, 2025 2:14 pm
> >
> > If "all" is distinct from "one", as you claim it is, then "all is not one". There is no one "all things".
>
> As distinctions they are distinct.
>
> Distinctions are things, parts of existence.
>
> As existence they both are.
>
> Feel free to address any of these statements:
>
> > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Thu Aug 14, 2025 2:07 pm
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Tue Aug 12, 2025 8:10 pm
> > >
> > > The ontology establishes parameters for substantiation. It isn't merely a test. However the parameters do function in that way.
> > >
> > > You claim this is merely rhetorical assertion. The terms are grounded in concrete examples dispelling such claims of rhetorical assertion. Is observing a tree rhetorical assertion? Is touching a leaf rhetorical assertion? Is hearing a bird rhetorical assertion?
> > >
> > > The definition serves to link the philosophically abstract to the obvious and the tangible.
> > >
> > > What is a better definition?
> > >
> > > What alternative definitions enable substantiation of existence?
> > >
> > > The definition provided allows substantiation and identification of existence. It makes existence real for lack of better terms. Alternative definitions do not.
> >
> > Most ontologies are locked in abstraction with relatively limited perspective.
> >
> > Identify an ontology as expansive with similar means of substantiation.

Nothing, as an absence of existence, is a paradox for absence is a concept that exists and absence of existence is an absence of the concept of absence.

The very term nothing is paradoxical and yet is necessary for existence to be distinct. What does existence gain contrast by for it to be distinct if not nothing?

If existence is purely distinct to itself then by default it is contradictory.

So how do you make the concept of existence distinct without using the very existence that defines it in doing so?

Last edited by Eodnhoj7 on Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:58 am, edited 1 time in total.

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:39 am

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Thu Aug 14, 2025 2:18 pm
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Thu Aug 14, 2025 2:14 pm
> >
> > Facepalm...okay I will break it down further:
> >
> > If "all" is distinct from "one", as you claim it is, then "all is not one". There is no one "all things".
>
> You are not breaking it down further.
>
> You are repeating the same thing.

Apparently you do not understand the contradiction you present by saying "all" is distinct from "one."

If "all" is distinct from "one" then "all" is not "one". If "all" is not "one" then "all" ceases to be the unified set you use to classify existence.

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:15 am

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:36 am
>
> Nothing, as an absence of existence, is a paradox for absence is a concept that exists and absence of existence is an absence of the concept of absence.

Again, nothing is not absence:

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2023 2:34 pm
>
> Absence and nothingness are not the same. Absence is a circumstance or condition and can be observed. Bob's absence from class Tuesday was acknowledged or observed by students, for example. Still only things occupied the room, students, desks, air, etcetera. All people and items referenced, Bob, class, the students, etcetera, are things, are existence. Nothingness, nonexistence is not and cannot be to be observed or referenced.

Absence is perceived indicating existence. Nothing is not and cannot be perceived.

There is no absence of existence. Existence is everywhere.

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:36 am
>
> The very term nothing is paradoxical and yet is necessary for existence to be distinct. What does existence gain contrast by for it to be distinct if not nothing?

Existence does not need to be distinct. That is a qualification you artificially place upon existence as a conscious individual.

Existence simply is.

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:39 am
>
> Apparently you do not understand the contradiction you present by saying "all" is distinct from "one."
>
> If "all" is distinct from "one" then "all" is not "one". If "all" is not "one" then "all" ceases to be the unified set you use to classify existence.

I did not propose "all is one". You are proposing that.

Provide a link or quote in which I declared "all is one".

All things are all things. Things are unified through commonality of being, through the commonality of existence.

You are essentially introducing and presenting your own convoluted statements as my own. That is intellectually dishonest.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:21 am

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:15 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:36 am
> >
> > Nothing, as an absence of existence, is a paradox for absence is a concept that exists and absence of existence is an absence of the concept of absence.
>
> Again, nothing is not absence:
>
> > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Thu Jan 16, 2023 2:34 pm
> >
> > Absence and nothingness are not the same. Absence is a circumstance or condition and can be observed. Bob's absence from class Tuesday was acknowledged or observed by students, for example. Still only things occupied the room, students, desks, air, etcetera. All people and items referenced, Bob, class, the students, etcetera, are things, are existence. Nothingness, nonexistence is not and cannot be to be observed or referenced.
>
> Absence is perceived indicating existence. Nothing is not and cannot be perceived.
>
> There is no absence of existence. Existence is everywhere.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:36 am
> >
> > The very term nothing is paradoxical and yet is necessary for existence to be distinct. What does existence gain contrast by for it to be distinct if not nothing?
>
> Existence does not need to be distinct. That is a qualification you artificially place upon existence as a conscious individual.
>
> Existence simply is.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 2:39 am
> >
> > Apparently you do not understand the contradiction you present by saying "all" is distinct from "one."
> >
> > If "all" is distinct from "one" then "all" is not "one". If "all" is not "one" then "all" ceases to be the unified set you use to classify existence.
>
> I did not propose "all is one". You are proposing that.
>
> Provide a link or quote in which I declared "all is one".
>
> All things are all things. Things are unified through commonality of being, through the commonality of existence.
>
> You are essentially introducing and presenting your own convoluted statements as my own. That is intellectually dishonest.

So nothing is not an absence? So nothing, no-thing, is not the absence of thingness? Okay....really?

The debate of nothingness is observed in Wikipedia and the terms provided for nothingness are:

"Nothing, no-thing, or *no thing is the complete absence of anything*, as the opposite of something and an antithesis of everything."

Wiki, for better or worse, is the general consensus as input is derived from all social hierarchies.

I did not read past your first point...I am trying to take you seriously but it is very difficult.

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:56 am

Okay so you pm me this:

"Use your real name, coward.

If you don't wish to respond to all the arguments, or even read the comments, then get back to your XBox, loser."

Rather than explain why "nothingness is not an absence of thingness" as you claim.

Is there something I am missing?

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:05 am

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:21 am
>
> So nothing is not an absence? So nothing, no-thing, is not the absence of thingness? Okay....really?

Nothing is a concept, a term.

As defined in the essay:

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
>
> Nonexistence (n.): Non-being; no thing, nothing, nothingness; is never perceived or interacted with other than as a concept or term; it does not and cannot exist. A contradictory concept and term.

There is no absence of existence. Existence is everywhere.

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:21 am
>
> The debate of nothingness is observed in Wikipedia and the terms provided for nothingness are:
>
> "Nothing, no-thing, or *no thing is the complete absence of anything*, as the opposite of something and an antithesis of everything."
>
> Wiki, for better or worse, is the general consensus as input is derived from all social hierarchies.

This is not Wikipedia.

This is a standalone, functional, foundational ontology.

The terms are clearly defined in the essay.

Even by Wikipedia's standards nothing does not exist. Where is a "complete absence of anything"? Can you locate that?

Anyone, anywhere, please locate a "complete absence of anything".

As stated, there is no absence of existence. Nothing is not and cannot be.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:05 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:21 am
> >
> > So nothing is not an absence? So nothing, no-thing, is not the absence of thingness? Okay....really?
>
> Nothing is a concept, a term.
>
> As defined in the essay:
>
> > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> >
> > Nonexistence (n.): Non-being; no thing, nothing, nothingness; is never perceived or interacted with other than as a concept or term; it does not and cannot exist. A contradictory concept and term.
>
> There is no absence of existence. Existence is everywhere.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 3:21 am
> >
> > The debate of nothingness is observed in Wikipedia and the terms provided for nothingness are:
> >
> > "Nothing, no-thing, or *no thing is the complete absence of anything*, as the opposite of something and an antithesis of everything."
> >
> > Wiki, for better or worse, is the general consensus as input is derived from all social hierarchies.
>
> This is not Wikipedia.
>
> This is a standalone, functional, foundational ontology.
>
> The terms are clearly defined in the essay.
>
> Even by Wikipedia's standards nothing does not exist. Where is a "complete absence of anything"? Can you locate that?
>
> Anyone, anywhere, please locate a "complete absence of anything".
>
> As stated, there is no absence of existence. Nothing is not and cannot be.

And the term nothing means "absence of anything" or "no thing".

Or are you creating your own definition? Is that the case for you thesis?

I am assuming you are defining the terms and not taking general meanings?

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Fri Aug 15, 2025 5:49 am

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am
>
> And the term nothing means "absence of anything" or "no thing".

The term is explicitly defined in the essay as illustrated in my comment above.

Once again you intentionally evade statements and arguments presented.

You claimed Wikipedia defines nothing as "complete absence of anything". Again, can you locate that? Can you locate a "complete absence of anything"? Can *anyone* locate a "complete absence of anything"? I contend one cannot.

Don't skip that previous paragraph; it's a significant point here. **I contend no one can successfully locate nothing**, as in a "complete absence of anything".

That premise ties directly into the definition of nothing (or nonexistence) provided with the ontology. Nothing or nonexistence can never be perceived or interacted with. By definition. In other words nothing cannot be located:

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
>
> Nonexistence (n.): Non-being; no thing, nothing, nothingness; is never perceived or interacted with other than as a concept or term; it does not and cannot exist. A contradictory concept and term.

It isn't a whimsical definition. It's based on explicitly established parameters and demonstrable evidence as conveyed with the paragraph above.

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am
>
> Or are you creating your own definition? Is that the case for you thesis?

Many philosophies and philosophers do. Take Heidegger or Spinoza for example. They created their own terms, definitions and axioms. It isn't that radical.

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am
>
> I am assuming you are defining the terms and not taking general meanings?

As stated, standard terms and definitions are ambiguous and circular, lacking practical means of substantiation:

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Wed May 14, 2025 9:00 am
>
> **The Term Existence**
>
> Terms and definitions are crucial for any topic of discussion.
>
> I contend the terms and definitions presented within this philosophy are more practical and more coherent than standard terms and definitions, specifically the term "existence".
>
> Standard definitions of existence are convoluted and circular. They provide no means of substantiation.
>
> Existence is commonly defined as:
>
> Existence (noun)
> 1 a : the state or fact of having being especially independently of human consciousness and as contrasted with nonexistence
> (Existence. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/existence)
>
> Existence (noun)
> 1. The fact or state of existing; being
> (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/existence)
>
> Existence (noun)
> 1. the fact or state of existing; being
> (Collins English Dictionary Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/existence)
>
> Existence is defined as being.
>
> Being is defined as existence:
>
> Being (noun)
> 1 a : the quality or state of having existence
> (Being. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/being)
>
> Being (noun)
> 1. The state or quality of having existence
> (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/being)
>
> Being (noun)
> 1. the state or fact of existing; existence
> (Collins English Dictionary Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/being)
>
> The terms and definitions are circular. Existence is being, being is existence. The terms form a circular loop.
>
> If existence is being, and being existence, what is being or existence? They are undefined.
>
> The philosophy presented, however, precisely defines what existence is:
>
> > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> >
> > *Existence (n.): Being; that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*
>
> There is no circular loop. Existence is explicitly defined with a practical, coherent definition.
>
> With the standard terms existence is ambiguous; existence is being which is existence.
>
> With the term provided existence is defined; existence is that which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part.
>
> Not only are the standard terms circular, they also fail to provide any substantiation of existence as the term presented here.
>
> With the definition provided one could point to a tree, or any other item, and easily declare existence. The tree would be perceived or interacted with substantiating it as existence. With the standard definition one would likely be rather perplexed.
>
> The dual-natured definition, involving both perception and interaction, frees the philosophy from a purely biological, conscious perspective of perception.
>
> The philosophy presented not only offers a comprehensive, comprehensible ontology it also offers clearer, more practical and more coherent definitions of key terms as illustrated here.

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:11 am

> **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 5:49 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am
> >
> > And the term nothing means "absence of anything" or "no thing".
>
> The term is explicitly defined in the essay as illustrated in my comment above.
>
> Once again you intentionally evade statements and arguments presented.
>
> You claimed Wikipedia defines nothing as "complete absence of anything". Again, can you locate that? Can you locate a "complete absence of anything"? Can *anyone* locate a "complete absence of anything"? I contend one cannot.
>
> Don't skip that previous paragraph; it's a significant point here. **I contend no one can successfully locate nothing**, as in a "complete absence of anything".
>
> That premise ties directly into the definition of nothing (or nonexistence) provided with the ontology. Nothing or nonexistence can never be perceived or interacted with. By definition. In other words nothing cannot be located:
>
> > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> >
> > Nonexistence (n.): Non-being; no thing, nothing, nothingness; is never perceived or interacted with other than as a concept or term; it does not and cannot exist. A contradictory concept and term.
>
> It isn't a whimsical definition. It's based on explicitly established parameters and demonstrable evidence as conveyed with the paragraph above.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am
> >
> > Or are you creating your own definition? Is that the case for you thesis?
>
> Many philosophies and philosophers do. Take Heidegger or Spinoza for example. They created their own terms, definitions and axioms. It isn't that radical.
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Fri Aug 15, 2025 4:29 am
> >
> > I am assuming you are defining the terms and not taking general meanings?
>
> As stated, standard terms and definitions are ambiguous and circular, lacking practical means of substantiation:
>
> > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Wed May 14, 2025 9:00 am
> >
> > **The Term Existence**
> >
> > Terms and definitions are crucial for any topic of discussion.
> >
> > I contend the terms and definitions presented within this philosophy are more practical and more coherent than standard terms and definitions, specifically the term "existence".
> >
> > Standard definitions of existence are convoluted and circular. They provide no means of substantiation.
> >
> > Existence is commonly defined as:
> >
> > Existence (noun)
> > 1 a : the state or fact of having being especially independently of human consciousness and as contrasted with nonexistence
> > (Existence. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/existence)
> >
> > Existence (noun)
> > 1. The fact or state of existing; being
> > (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/existence)
> >
> > Existence (noun)
> > 1. the fact or state of existing; being
> > (Collins English Dictionary Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/existence)
> >
> > Existence is defined as being.
> >
> > Being is defined as existence:
> >
> > Being (noun)
> > 1 a : the quality or state of having existence
> > (Being. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/being)
> >
> > Being (noun)
> > 1. The state or quality of having existence
> > (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/being)
> >
> > Being (noun)
> > 1. the state or fact of existing; existence
> > (Collins English Dictionary Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition https://www.thefreedictionary.com/being)
> >
> > The terms and definitions are circular. Existence is being, being is existence. The terms form a circular loop.
> >
> > If existence is being, and being existence, what is being or existence? They are undefined.
> >
> > The philosophy presented, however, precisely defines what existence is:
> >
> > > **daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑ Fri Jun 16, 2023 5:44 pm
> > >
> > > *Existence (n.): Being; that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*
> >
> > There is no circular loop. Existence is explicitly defined with a practical, coherent definition.
> >
> > With the standard terms existence is ambiguous; existence is being which is existence.
> >
> > With the term provided existence is defined; existence is that which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part.
> >
> > Not only are the standard terms circular, they also fail to provide any substantiation of existence as the term presented here.
> >
> > With the definition provided one could point to a tree, or any other item, and easily declare existence. The tree would be perceived or interacted with substantiating it as existence. With the standard definition one would likely be rather perplexed.
> >
> > The dual-natured definition, involving both perception and interaction, frees the philosophy from a purely biological, conscious perspective of perception.
> >
> > The philosophy presented not only offers a comprehensive, comprehensible ontology it also offers clearer, more practical and more coherent definitions of key terms as illustrated here.

You claim nothingness is a contradictory term, which I also stated, and yet for existence to be distinct you need nothingness to stand apart from...existence needs contradiction.

However if you claim existence does not need this contradiction to be distinct then by default existence has to be distinct from itself to gain meaning...and this leads it to contradict itself...which again necessitates contradiction.

So which is it so that existence is distinct?

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:16 am

There is no infinite existence.. That's what infinity actually means.

Infinity is a mental projection, a trickless trick the mind plays with itself.

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:37 am

> **Fairy wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:16 am
>
> There is no infinite existence.. That's what infinity actually means.
>
> Infinity is a mental projection, a trickless trick the mind plays with itself.

He fails to see that in conceptualizing the infinite he makes it finite...and his argument is grounded in the paradox he is trying to avoid.

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:44 am

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:37 am
>
> > **Fairy wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:16 am
> >
> > There is no infinite existence.. That's what infinity actually means.
> >
> > Infinity is a mental projection, a trickless trick the mind plays with itself.
>
> He fails to see that in conceptualizing the infinite he makes it finite...and his argument is grounded in the paradox he is trying to avoid.

Very good, well said. 👍

He's not seeing it yet, that's for sure.

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:54 am

> **Fairy wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:44 am
>
> > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:37 am
> >
> > > **Fairy wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:16 am
> > >
> > > There is no infinite existence.. That's what infinity actually means.
> > >
> > > Infinity is a mental projection, a trickless trick the mind plays with itself.
> >
> > He fails to see that in conceptualizing the infinite he makes it finite...and his argument is grounded in the paradox he is trying to avoid.
>
> Very good, well said. 👍
>
> He's not seeing it yet, that's for sure.

He invested to much effort in his thesis...I doubt he ever will. The thing that holds us back the most is what we idolize.

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:57 am

> **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:54 am
>
> > **Fairy wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:44 am
> >
> > > **Eodnhoj7 wrote:** ↑ Sat Aug 16, 2025 7:37 am
> > >
> > > He fails to see that in conceptualizing the infinite he makes it finite...and his argument is grounded in the paradox he is trying to avoid.
> >
> > Very good, well said. 👍
> >
> > He's not seeing it yet, that's for sure.
>
> He invested to much effort in his thesis...I doubt he ever will. The thing that holds us back the most is what we idolize.

So true Eod, so true.

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Fairy** » Sat Aug 16, 2025 8:00 am

I could literally write nonstop until the cows come home, but I intuitively know there's no point.

Why, because I simply discovered that when one thing is known then everything is known. That's all there is to know.

Fairy
Posts: 2631
Joined: Thu May 09, 2024 7:07 pm
Location: The United Kingdom of Heaven

Post Reply · 731 posts 1 … 42 43 44 45 46 … 49

‹ Return to "General Philosophical Discussion" · Jump to

Philosophy Now magazine ‹ Board index · Contact us · Delete cookies · All times are UTC+01:00

Powered by phpBB® Forum Software © phpBB Limited
Privacy | Terms